

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

After entry of the foregoing amendment, Claims 15, 16, 18-28 and 30 remain pending in the present application. Claims 17 and 29 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 15, 16, 18-20, 22, 24-28 and 30 are amended to address cosmetic matters of form and to incorporate features of the specification described at least at page 8. No new matter has been added.

By way of summary, the Official Action presents the following issues: the Title of the Invention stands objected to as to matters of form; Claims 29-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly non-statutory; Claims 15-16 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being unpatentable over Chang et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0131167, hereinafter Chang); and Claims 23 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Chang in further view of Ludwig et al. (U.S. Patent 7,185,054, hereinafter Ludwig).

OBJECTION TO THE TITLE

The Official Action at paragraph 1 identifies a spelling error allegedly recited in the present Title of the application. Applicant has reviewed the submitted specification, including the electronic version available on the Patent Application Information and Retrieval system (PAIR) and are unable to identify this spelling error. As such, Applicant will treat this rejection as if it were made in error.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101

The Official Action has rejected Claims 29-30 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly reciting non-statutory subject matter.

In response, Applicant has deleted Claim 29 and has amended Claim 30 to recite a computer readable storage medium in accordance with current Office guidelines.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. §101 be withdrawn.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

The Official Action has rejected Claims 15-16 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being unpatentable over Chang. The Official Action contends that Chang describes all of the Applicant's claimed features. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant's amended Claim 15 recites, *inter alia*, a device for managing remote conferences including:

means for receiving, from a telephone conference bridge, participant audio presence data of an audio conference;

storage means for storing user telephone number data in association with device data identifying a user multimedia apparatus;

means for determining, by the audio presence data and the device data, multimedia apparatuses of participants of the audio conference; and

means for providing multimedia data files to the multimedia apparatus using the device data.

Chang describes a method by which participants of a conference call may be automatically contacted utilizing a call log feature of a communication device. In operation, a conference database (135) may be utilized for storing conference logistics for use by the

system. The conference logistics may be provided by a user in response to a menu system.¹ Additionally, a profile database (140) may be created for storing participant profile data, such as telephone number and address information.

Conversely, in an exemplary embodiment of the Applicant's claimed advancements, a device for managing remote conferences is provided. Participant audio presence is provided from a telephone conference bridge of a telephone conference. A user telephone number is stored in association with device data identifying a user multimedia apparatus. Multimedia apparatuses of participants of the audio conference are determined based upon the audio presence data and the device data. Multimedia data files are provided to at least one of multimedia apparatuses using the device data.

Chang does not disclose or suggest providing multimedia data files based upon device data stored in association with a telephone number corresponding to a participant of an audio conference as recited in amended Claim 15, and by virtue of dependency, any claim depending therefrom. Likewise, independent Claims 22 and 30 recite substantially similar features to that discussed above.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 15-16 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102 be withdrawn.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

The Official Action has rejected Claims 23 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Ludwig. The Official Action contends that the combination of the cited references provide all of Applicant's claimed features. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

¹ See Chang et al. at paragraph [0037].

As noted above, Chang does not provide all of the features of the Applicant's amended claims for which it has been asserted. Likewise, as Ludwig does not remedy the deficiency discussed above, either alone or in combination, with Chang, Applicant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been presented.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 23 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Consequently, in view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)
SAM/rac



Scott A. McKeown
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 42,866